

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-14 and 16-38 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lahey et al. (US 6,587,217).

A. Claim 29

Claim 29, as amended, recites the feature of an archiving unit operable to archive the plurality of the print data files into a file after the printing apparatus changes a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file. Applicants respectfully submit that Lahey does not disclose or suggest at least the above-noted feature recited in claim 29.

Regarding Lahey, Applicants note that this reference discloses a printing management system having a plurality of client computers 4a-4c, an InfoPrint Multiple Printer Controller (MPC) server 6, and an InfoPrint library 36 (see Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 28-33; and col. 5, lines 19-25). As disclosed in Lahey, each of the client computers 4a-4c has installed therein InfoPrint Submit software 10 which allows a user to create and submit a job ticket, wherein the job ticket maintains information on print attributes and the location of the print files which comprise the print job (see col. 4, lines 44-47 and col. 5, lines 51-53).

As explained in Lahey, a user is able to create a job ticket via a graphical user interface

(GUI) 60 by entering information into different fields and selecting specific options presented therein (see col. 7, lines 50-53). In this regard, as disclosed in connection with Fig. 8 of Lahey, via the GUI 60, a user is able to open a previously created job ticket (Open), create a new job ticket (New), save a job ticket the user has modified (Save or Save as), or submit the job ticket to the InfoPrint MPC server 6 for printing (Submit Job) (see col. 8, line 61 through col. 9, line 5).

As further disclosed in Lahey, a user can store job tickets and the associated files in the InfoPrint library 36 by selecting an Archive function displayed in the Ticket submenu 80 (see Fig. 8 and col. 14, lines 1-3). In this regard, as explained in connection with Fig. 14 of Lahey, if it is determined that a user has requested to archive a job ticket (step 166), a database index is created describing the parameters of the job ticket and the files referenced therein (step 168), and the job ticket and related files are stored in a subdirectory of the InfoPrint library 36 (step 172) (see col. 14, lines 20-31).

As noted above, claim 29 has been amended to recite the feature of an archiving unit operable to archive the plurality of the print data files into a file after the printing apparatus changes a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

Regarding such a feature, Applicants note that in the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the above-noted ability in Lahey for a user to save a job ticket that the user has modified (e.g., Save as) corresponds to the claimed feature of the printing apparatus changing a name of one print data file to a “specified name” (see Office Action at page 3).

With respect to such a position, Applicants note that while a user of Lahey is able to save the job ticket with a desired name, that this desired name is not a predetermined name for allowing the InfoPrint MPC server 6 to identify the file as a job ticket. In other words, Applicants note that because the name of the job ticket can be freely chosen by the user, it is clear that the name of the job ticket in Lahey is not a predetermined name, and that the name of the job ticket is not used to allow a printing apparatus to identify the file as a job ticket.

As such, Applicants submit that Lahey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 29 of an archiving unit operable to archive the plurality of the print data files into a file after the printing apparatus changes a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 29 is patentable over Lahey, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claim 30

Claim 30, as amended, recites the feature of an archiving unit operable to archive one print data file of the plurality of the print data files in a specified position in an archived file, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified position being a predetermined position for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file. Applicants respectfully submit that Lahey does not disclose or suggest at

least this feature of amended claim 30.

With respect to Lahey, as described above, a user is able to store job tickets and the associated files in the InfoPrint library 36 by selecting an Archive function displayed in the Ticket submenu 80 (see Fig. 8 and col. 14, lines 1-3). In this regard, as explained in connection with Fig. 14 of Lahey, if it is determined that a user has requested to archive a job ticket (step 166), a database index is created describing the parameters of the job ticket and the files referenced therein (step 168), and the job ticket and related files are stored in a subdirectory of the InfoPrint library 36 (step 172) (see col. 14, lines 20-31).

Thus, in Lahey, while the job ticket and related files are stored in a subdirectory of the InfoPrint library 36 when an Archive function is selected, Applicants respectfully submit the job ticket is not stored in specified position in an archived file, and that the job ticket is not stored a predetermined position for allowing a printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the job ticket. In other words, in Lahey, because the job ticket and related files are all stored in the same subdirectory, Applicants note that the job ticket is not stored in an archived file, and that the position in which the job ticket is stored is clearly not a predetermined position that allows a printing apparatus to identify the file as a job ticket.

As such, Applicants submit that Lahey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 30 of an archiving unit operable to archive one print data file of the plurality of the print data files in a specified position in an archived file, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified position being a predetermined position for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 30 is patentable over Lahey, an indication of which is kindly requested.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 22-25, 31, 33, 35 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry (US 2003/0095284) in view of Lahey et al. (US 6,587,217).

Regarding claim 1, Applicants note that this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 29. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the archiving unit archives the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing a printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 29, Applicants respectfully submit that Lahey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 1. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Parry does not cure this deficiency of Lahey. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 4, 5 and 7-11 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 3, Applicants note that this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 30. In particular, claim 3 has been amended to recite that the archiving unit archives

one print data file of the plurality of the print data files in a specified position in the archived file, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified position being a predetermined position for allowing a printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 30, Applicants respectfully submit that Lahey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 3. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Parry does not cure this deficiency of Lahey. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 3 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 22, Applicants note that this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite that the plurality of the print data files are archived into the archived file after a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files is changed to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing said printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Lahey does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 22 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 31, Applicants note that this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite that the archiving unit archives the plurality of the print data

files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Lahey does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 33, Applicants note that this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite that the archiving step comprises archiving the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Lahey does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 33 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 35, Applicants note this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite that the archiving comprises archiving the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified

name being a predetermined name for allowing a printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Lahey does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 35 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 37, Applicants note this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite that the plurality of the print data files are archived into the archived file after a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files is changed to a specified name, the one print data file being a Top Page print data file, and the specified name being a predetermined name for allowing the printing apparatus to identify a print data file as the Top Page print data file.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Lahey does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 37 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry in view of Lahey et al., and further in view of Agranat et al. (US 6,456,308).

Claim 6 depends from claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Agranat does not cure the deficiencies of Parry and Lahey, as discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

C. Claims 12-14, 16-21, 26-28, 32, 34, 36 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry in view of Lahey et al., and further in view of Nakatsuma et al. (US 6,115,132).

Claim 12 recites the feature of a sequential transmission unit operable to sequentially transmit to the printing apparatus the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information indicating that the plurality of the print data files to be transmitted are the print data files composing the print document. In the final Office Action and the Advisory Action, the Examiner has taken the position that Nakatsuma discloses such a feature. Applicants kindly request that the Examiner reconsider this position in view of the comments below.

Regarding Nakatsuma, Applicants note that this reference discloses a printing system having a server 101, a plurality of clients 102, and a network printer 105 (see Fig. 1). As explained in Nakatsuma, the clients 102 send the print data directly to the network printer 105, and send only job information of print data corresponding to a plurality of print jobs to the server 101 (see Abstract; col. 22, lines 55-59; and col. 28, lines 42-52). By referring to the job information received from the clients 102, Nakatsuma discloses that the server 101 is able to control a printing order of the print jobs (see Abstract and col. 28, lines 46-52).

In the final Office Action and in the Advisory Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the server 101 of Nakatsuma corresponds to the claimed “sequential transmission unit”. As is clear from the above-noted description of Nakatsuma, however, the server 101 does not transmit the print data to the network printer 105. Instead, as explained above, the clients 102 send the print data to the network printer 105.

Accordingly, because the server 101 of Nakatsuma does not transmit a plurality of print data files to the print server 105, but instead, merely receives job information about the print data from the clients 102, Applicants respectfully submit that Nakatsuma does not disclose or suggest the above-noted feature recited in claim 12 of a sequential transmission unit that is operable to sequentially transmit to the printing apparatus the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information indicating that the plurality of the print data files to be transmitted are the print data files composing the print document.

In addition, regarding the above-noted feature of a sequential transmission unit operable to sequentially transmit to the printing apparatus the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information indicating that the plurality of the print data files to be transmitted are the print data files composing the print document, Applicants note that the Examiner has not addressed the underlined feature above of “information indicating that the plurality of the print data files to be transmitted are the print data files composing the print document”. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that Nakatsuma does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the use of such “information”.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least the above-noted feature recited in claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Further, regarding claim 12, Applicants note that claim 12 also recites that the sequential transmission unit transmits sequentially the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the print

document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document.

With respect to the above-noted feature, Applicants note that in the final Office Action and the Advisory Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the server 101 of Nakatsuma corresponds to the above-noted “sequential transmission unit”. In particular, Applicants note that in the Advisory Action, the Examiner has indicated that “it is being interpreted by the examiner that the server can determine the transmitting order of the plurality of print jobs/files” (see Advisory Action at page 3).

Regarding the above-noted position taken by the Examiner, as explained above, Applicants point out to the Examiner that the server 101 does not transmit print data files to the network printer 105, but instead, merely receives job information from the clients 102 and manages a print order in accordance with the received job information. In this regard, as described above, it is the client devices 102 of Nakatsuma that transmit the print data to the network printer 105.

Thus, Applicants note that while the server 101 is able to manage a print order based on the job information received from the clients 102, the server 101 does not sequentially transmit a plurality of print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document.

Further, with respect to the above-noted language indicating that the plurality of print data files are accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files

composing the print document, Applicants respectfully point out that the Examiner appears to have misinterpreted this language recited in claim 12.

In particular, Applicants point out that the above-noted language in claim 12 makes it clear that the print document is composed of the plurality of print data files, wherein information is transmitted on a total number of the plurality of the print data files and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files. In contrast to such a feature, Applicants point out that in Nakatsuma, the print data that is sent from the clients 102 to the network printer 105 are individual print documents, and clearly do not compose a “print document”.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature of claim 12 which sets forth that the sequential transmission unit transmits sequentially the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 13, 14 and 17-21 depend from claim 12 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 16, Applicants note that this claim recites the feature of a sequential transmission unit operable to sequentially transmit to the printing apparatus the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information indicating that the plurality of the print data files to be transmitted are the print data files composing the print document.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12, Applicants

respectfully submit that Nakatsuma does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature, and that the other cited prior art references do not cure this deficiency of Nakatsuma. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

In addition, Applicants note that claim 16 recites that the sequential transmission unit transmits the plurality of the print data files accompanied by a flag indicating a completion of the transmission, the flag being attached to one print data file to be transmitted to the printing apparatus last out of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document. In the final Office Action and the Advisory Action, the Examiner has recognized that neither Parry nor Lahey discloses such a feature, but has taken the position that Nakatsuma cures this deficiency of Parry and Lahey.

In particular, regarding Nakatsuma, the Examiner has indicated that the description therein of a data transfer end flag corresponds to the above-noted feature recited in claim 16 (e.g., see Advisory Action at page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, Applicants note that in Nakatsuma, the transfer end flag is set after a client device 102 finishes transferring print data to the network printer 105, wherein after the data transfer is complete, the server 101 is informed of the data transfer (see col. 22, lines 58-59; col. 23, lines 42-44; and col. 25, lines 5-8 and lines 62-65).

Based on the foregoing description, Applicants note that while Nakatsuma discloses the ability for an end flag to be set after a client device finishes transferring print data to the network printer, wherein the server 101 is notified of such data transmission, that such disclosure does not in any way whatsoever correspond to a sequential transmission unit that transmits a plurality of

print data files accompanied by a flag indicating a completion of the transmission.

Further, with respect to the above-noted language in claim 16 which indicates that the flag is attached to one print data file to be transmitted to the printing apparatus last out of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document, as discussed above, in Nakatsuma, the print data that is sent from the clients 102 to the network printer 105 are individual print documents that are each related to a different print job. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the plurality of print data of Nakatsuma that is transferred from the clients to the network printer clearly does not compose a “print document”.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claims 26, 32, 34, 36 and 38, for at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 12 and 16, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the features recited therein. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 26, 32, 34, 36 and 38 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 26 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned
at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Shigeki MATSUNAGA et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/

By: 2008.10.06 20:48:08 -04'00'

Kenneth W. Fields

Registration No. 52,430

Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krq
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 6, 2008